DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 462 239 RC 023 393

AUTHOR	Linn, Mary S.; Naranjo, Tessie; Nicholas, Sheilah; Slaughter, Inee; Yamamoto, Akira; Zepeda, Ofelia
TITLE	Awakening the Languages. Challenges of Enduring Language Programs: Field Reports from 15 Programs from Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	24p.; In: Indigenous Languages across the Community. Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Stabilizing Indigenous Languages (7th, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, May 11-14, 2000); see RC 023 385.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Indian Education; *American Indian Languages; Community Programs; *Educational Strategies; *Language Maintenance; Native Language Instruction; Program Development; Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS	Endangered Languages; *Oklahoma

ABSTRACT

The Indigenous Language Institute (ILI) collaborates with indigenous language communities to combat language decline. ILI facilitates community-based language programs, increases public awareness of language endangerment, and disseminates information on language preservation and successful language revitalization programs. In response to numerous questions about what works, ILI researchers visited 15 language programs in Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. This paper reports findings on Oklahoma. With the exception of California, Oklahoma has the greatest diversity of Native languages and peoples in the United States. All Native languages in Oklahoma are threatened; most are severely endangered. A chart presents languages and linguistic families of Oklahoma, with number of speakers. Oklahoma tribal people do not have a land base, and their children are seldom the majority in public schools. Most Native language programs are grassroots and struggle for funds, teachers, and even community acceptance. Most programs pass through certain vital stages: commitment of the heart, awareness of the reality of the language situation, committed experimentation, re-contextualizing language and culture, transforming the culture of school, re-creating classrooms, and changing attitudes from hurt to responsibility. Successful approaches include using community language teams, promoting immersion, being family-oriented, setting goals, developing a few fluent speakers before expanding the program, balancing tradition and innovation, addressing language variation issues, working through politics, and persevering. The following are not necessary: money, tribal support, or a large number of speakers. ILI plans to create "facts" and "how-to" brochures are described. (Contains 34 references.) (SV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 462 239

Awakening the Languages
Challenges of Enduring Language Programs: Field reports from 15 Programs from Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma

Mary S. Linn, Tessie Naranjo, Sheilah Nicholas, Inée Slaughter,
Akira Yamamoto, Ofelia Zepeda

Part I: Settings for the Indigenous Language Institute (ILI)

People's attitudes toward languages often have a stronger impact on the future of those languages than official language policies. Native American languages in North America are no exception. They have been negatively affected by the sense of "worthlessness" that the language communities have developed since the onslaught of European people. Various pressures were placed on Native American language communities from outside. Diseases unknown to Native Americans were introduced, and they spread rapidly among them. Wars with the invaders and amongst each other owing to rapidly changing alliances wiped out large segments of the population. Languages, too, faced imminent decline. The spread of Europeans into Native American territories forced the relocation of indigenous populations to unfamiliar regions, often uninhabitable by European standards. Different Native American groups, who were all autonomous sovereign nations, were sometimes forced to live in the same region. This would sometimes cause languages to shift with the new contacts, or, more radically, one language would be subsumed by dominance or by intermarriages within a larger group. Later still, forceful recruitment of children was practiced in the name of education—they were removed to boarding schools, which were often located far from their home communities. Christianization was equated with "civilizing" the savage. Such practice was forcefully stated by J.D.C. Atkins, Commissioner of Indian affairs from 1885 to 1888: "The instruction of the Indians in the vernacular is not only of no use to them, but is detrimental to the cause of their education and civilization and no school will be permitted on the reservation in which the English language is not exclusively taught" (1887, pp. xxi-xxiii).

Issues of language choice, of majority and minority conflicts, of identity crises, and of numerous other concerns result when two or more cultures come into contact. This is especially true when the contact situation is unbalanced—one is more powerful politically, militarily, economically, and/or demographically. This is also true when the contact situation is a relatively long lasting one. Native American peoples have had to face the Europeans permanently in this power-unbalanced encounter situation. Children were educated in boarding schools where the language of instruction and of communication was English. People only in their forties still remember their boarding school days when one word of their ancestral language resulted in their mouth being rinsed with soap in order to wash out their "bad" language. When they became parents, they certainly did not want their children to go through the same hardship. So they

RC 023393

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jon Reyhner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

encouraged their children to learn English, not their ancestral languages. What a powerful and effective method of replacing ancestral languages with English this was (Yamamoto & Zepeda, in press)!

Even today, we continue to see the same kinds of attitudes toward Native American peoples and their languages as in the 1800s. For example, an argument not unlike that of J.D.C. Atkins' has been used to establish "English As the Official Language" policy. Twenty-four states have already passed such legislation, the earliest being Louisiana in 1811. Four states have English Plus legislation, which states that English must be learned in addition to one's heritage language. Also, eight states have debated Official English legislation since 1999. This means, 74% of the states are participating in some form of legislation that places English above a person's Native or ancestral language. In the 2000 debate in Oklahoma, initiative supporters said that Official English legislation should establish English as "the authoritative language and ban state money from being spent on translations for public documents or providing services in a different language" (Tulsa World, June 18, 2000). Clearly, the policies and debates on the state level and at the national level continue to promote the sense of "worthlessness" placed on Native ways by the colonizers (Yamamoto & Zepeda, in press).

Despite history and legislation, attitudes concerning the worthiness of language have been on the rise. The late 1980s saw the mobilization of Native American educators, leaders, and academic professionals, and a new linguistic culture emerged. Specifically, at the 1987 Native American Language Issues Conference in Tempe, Arizona, conference participants formulated a resolution proclaiming the language rights of Native Americans. That resolution found its way to Senator Inouye, who was heading the Special Committee on Indian Affairs. Eventually, the resolution turned into the Native American Languages Act (Public Law 101-477) on October 30, 1990, signed by President Bush. What is important here is that Native American languages were officially recognized as vital to Native Americans. Among other statements, Section 102 of the Native American Languages Act of 1990 reads:

> (3) the traditional languages of Native Americans are an integral part of their cultures and identities and form the basic medium for the transmission, and thus survival, of Native American cultures, literatures, histories, religions, political institutions, and values;
> (9) languages are the means of communication for the full range of human experiences and are critical to the survival of cultural and political integrity of any people.

This Public Law was followed by another Native American Languages Act in 1992 (Public Law 102-524) that authorized two million dollars for the fiscal year 1993 to be spent on community based language programs. These community based projects may be large in scope or small, including the development of literature and teaching materials, teacher training, bringing speakers and non-speakers together, and recording oral history and stories, among others. On March

25, 1994, the Administration for Native Americans announced the availability of one million dollars for NALA projects. The amount of funding gradually increased to the original proposal of two million dollars, and many Native language communities have taken advantage of this opportunity.

Part II: Indigenous Language Institute

The Indigenous Language Institute (ILI, Inée Yang Slaughter, Executive Director) was founded as IPOLA (Institute for the Preservation of the Original Languages of the Americas) in 1992 in response to the urgent needs of Native American communities that were facing imminent danger of losing their languages and were attempting to combat language decline. ILI's mission is to collaborate with indigenous language communities to reverse language shift. Specifically, it focuses on three major areas:

1. Facilitation of community-based language programs. When community members become aware of their endangered language situation, they may want to design a language program to revitalize their language. When such a situation arises, ILI should be able to provide financial assistance. ILI needs to be able to provide information on how to document a language, on how to plan a language revitalization program, on what programs have been effective in what communities, on how to train speakers to be teachers, on what type of language curriculum works for what kinds of learners, and on preparing effective language materials.

2. Increasing public awareness of language endangerment in Indigenous language communities. ILI will continue to appeal to the general public and to make known the severity of language decline in indigenous communities through campaigns and educational materials. ILI will mobilize educators, linguists, anthropologists, community leaders, and policy makers to convey a clear message to the public that the loss of indigenous languages means the disintegration of cultures and eventual death. This has been stated so precisely by the Hawai'ian Immersion Program: "If you want to kill a people, take away their language." We must make sure that this will never happen.

3. Development of a National Info-net Centre for Indigenous Language Programs. In order for ILI, or any other group, to be able to function effectively as a collaborator in community-based language programs or as a language rights activist educating the general public, it must have a wealth of knowledge on what works and what does not work in the (re)vitalization of languages. We need to have a place where language educators can turn in order to get information on: (a) documentation (e.g., how to document a language where there may be only a handful of speakers left, and who can work with them to document them); (b) analyses and descriptions of languages (e.g., for the purpose of creating a new generation of speakers, what materials need to be prepared, in what order, in what form); (c) the production of materials (e.g., in what forms should the material be produced); (d) successful language (re)vitalization programs (e.g., what programs have been effective and under what conditions, what informa-

tion is available on it, is it replicable); and (e) the availability, in general, of any professional assistance (e.g., linguists, anthropologists, educators, computer technicians, educational technologists, writers, etc.) and of any technical assistance.

In March 1997, ILI invited about 40 Native American educators, language specialists, and linguists for an intensive 3-day meeting. The purpose of the symposium was to review the indigenous language situations in the United States, to discover what has been done to address language endangerment, to debate what needs to be done about reversing language shift, and to formulate an institution where all the necessary work can be performed for the vitalization and revitalization of indigenous languages. The symposium attendants drew up a blueprint for the Indigenous Language Institute (ILI). Among the major tasks of the ILI is the item (d) above: to provide information on successful language (re)vitalization programs. The institute should be able to provide information services to meet the needs of individuals, programs, and communities. Information needs to be gathered on the types of programs being practiced, what strategies work, what must be done to make a language program effective in achieving its goals, and what challenges there are for establishing an effective community language program and what possible answers may be there to address those challenges.

In order meet this goal, the institute must build a solid database on various language programs around the nation and, eventually, the American continent, and it must network a wide range of language research, language teaching, language archive, and funding sources. In addition, "connectedness" should provide the institute with the list of consultants and specialists who can work with those who are in need of technical assistance. The current project is a direct response to these urgent needs in fulfilment of the ILI goals.

Part III: The ILI Language Programs Project

Although many successful language programs of various kinds have been reported at conferences, oftentimes we do not hear about the struggles endured during the process of creating, maintaining, and enhancing programs. We do not have sufficient information on their problems and on how they resolved them. It is usually the case that new programs go through the same problems as already established ones; that is, new programs reinvent the wheel. In addition, at many language maintenance conferences, the need for a central information centre where community language workers can get information about programs and contact people is restated. ILI has received numerous phone calls and inquiries about model programs, potential difficulties, and how to resolve problems. These requests motivated us to develop a project that would make intensive field visits to selected programs. This project is outlined here, and the discussion includes our preliminary findings and a note about the future of the project.

Goal of Program Data Collection, Analysis, Compilation, & Dissemination

As stated above, the goal of the ILI language program project is to centralize crucial information on language programs so that indigenous communities can share and learn from each other in order to make their programs even more effective and to make the information available to those communities that are ready to begin their language programs.

Many communities are now looking for ways to revive, vitalize, revitalize, and stabilize their heritage languages. Many other communities have been operating many different types of language programs (e.g., family oral/literacy programs, pre-school and day-care total immersion programs, school-based immersion or heritage language as a second language programs, heritage language as an academic subject program, community-based heritage language immersion or as a second language programs for children, young adults, and/or adults, etc.). There is, however, no composite data on these different program types, on the different processes followed in establishing programs, on the problems and issues surrounding programs, on how programs are operated, on what needs may exist in programs, and, more important, on "how-to" methods.

Therefore, the purposes of this "program data collection" project are to gather information from as many different types of programs as possible, to analyze the projects in order to find some common methods and processes, to discover under what conditions programs are most effective, to look at problems and issues, and to create an organized data base. This project entails sending linguists and language educators into the field to visit a variety of language programs. The information gathered will then be disseminated to a wide range of communities and individuals who plan to create new programs.

Field Staff

The ILI Executive Committee conducted a careful search for language specialists, linguists, and educators who could carry out such field inquiries. Three individuals were hired. Each has experience working with Native American peoples, and the Committee feels they are flexible and sensitive to the needs of language communities and efficient in processing field data. Tessie Naranjo (Santa Clara Pueblo) is a Native speaker of the Tewa language and a member of the Board of ILI. Sheilah Nichols (Hopi) is a doctoral student in the American Indian Studies at the University of Arizona. Mary Linn has been working with the Euchee people of Oklahoma since 1996 and has been active in language maintenance and revitalization through the Oklahoma Native Languages Association since its beginning in 1997. She is a Ph.D. candidate in linguistics at the University of Kansas. The three field linguists work closely with Ms. Inée Slaughter of ILI, Dr. Ofelia Zepeda (Tohonno O'odham) at the University of Arizona, and Dr. Akira Yamamoto at the University of Kansas.

Preparation

The first task was to decide which programs to visit. Although our choices are continually updated and expanded, in the first year, we concentrated on ar-

eas familiar to us: Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. As the program continues, we will look at existing language programs that the ANA has funded and at the Endangered Language Fund (ELF) supported programs and projects, and we will gather information from more individually-based "volunteer" work (e.g., Emory Sekaquaptewa, a Hopi linguist at the University of Arizona, University of Kansas team, etc.).

Because of our limited resources, we are not able to visit every program. We have chosen to visit a variety of programs in order to get an overview of the types of programs that communities are implementing, the problems that each type is faced with, and how they overcome these problems. So, for example, there are many language programs in Oklahoma, and five have been visited so far. They include programs in smaller tribes (2,000 people) and in larger tribes (10,000 plus), community-based and tribally sponsored programs, adult classes, Master-Apprentice programs, and materials development programs. Still, we have missed some very good programs.

Once a program has been identified as a potential site to visit, Tessie Naranjo, the co-ordinator of this project, contacts the appropriate person in charge and asks them if they would like to participate in the ILI project. When a positive response is received, the field linguist then makes the arrangements for the visitation date. Each visit includes going to the class or project in addition to taking time to talk with the teachers, Elders, students, and others who may be in charge or active participants. The visit may take a day or close to a week depending on the scope of the language activities in each community.

The Visit

Once in the community, the field linguists observe the classes and the program activities. In some cases, they are asked to participate as a student or trainee. Through observation and through direct conversations with the individuals in the programs, the field linguists gather the following information:

Community profile.

- Location
- Total population
- Estimated number of speakers
- Position of the language program in the community (tribal, grassroots, degree of community support—including financial support)

Language program profile.

(a) How the program was established: a brief history that includes a description of where it belongs (e.g., as a part of the tribal school, of the public school, of the continuing education, etc.) and who was instrumental in establishing it (e.g., a special office in the community such as the Language and Culture Department, Language Committee, volunteer/advocate group, church group, etc.). It is especially important for the field linguists to note the issues and problems faced while the program was being established and after the program had been

set up. They might ask the people what "advice" program coordinators might have for someone trying to create a new program:

- in selecting a type of the program
- in getting the leaders and community people involved in the process
- in selecting the program management staff
- in selecting the program teaching staff
- in preparing the program curriculum development
- in preparing the program materials development
- in documenting the language
- in interpreting the language data into teaching materials
- in recruiting learners
- in finding places for the program implementation
- in assessing the degree of participation by children and younger population
- in evaluating the impact of the program

(b) The goals of the program: including immediate or specific objectives. What is aimed at and when is it to be accomplished?

(c) How they are to be accomplished: for example, by teaching in a tribal school class, how often, how long for each session; by implementing a master-apprentice approach; etc. Who manages it: for example, a designated tribal office, the Bilingual Education Unit in the school district, etc. Include who finances it—by grant money from ANA, by the tribe, etc.

(d) Who are the teachers?: how teachers are selected, recruited, and trained.

(e) Who are the learners?: children, adults, families. How are they "recruited"?

(f) What materials are used?: including the process and personnel who prepare and produce language materials (documentation of language, grammar, dictionary, books, interactive materials, photo-books, language tapes, language cards, etc.).

(g) Are there language researchers separate in addition to teachers?: How are they recruited and trained? What do they do? Do those researchers participate in the language program? How do they contribute to the goal of the program?

(h) Are there curriculum and materials developers in addition to teachers?: If so, how are they recruited and trained?

Results of the program. How long has the program been running? How have the objectives been accomplished? What has been effective?

Needs of the program. What are the needs of the program? What would make the program even more effective and successful? The answers to these questions, we hope, will allow the field linguists to infer the problems the program may have encountered.

Sharing. Can the curricula, materials, or anything else be shared with other communities? Can ILI have a copy of relevant materials, and is it allowed to disseminate that information to inquirers or can inquirers contact the program? Who can be contacted and how?

After the visit is completed, the field linguists write up a report about the program. The report basically follows the outline above. A copy of the report is sent to the people in the program so that they may make suggestions and corrections. Once they have given their okay, the report becomes part of our growing bank of information on how the goals of language programs are achieved.

Preliminary Report on the Findings

What follows is a midyear report on the field research of the three linguists. Here, we will briefly describe characteristics of 15 programs in three regions: Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico. Language situations in Arizona and New Mexico are yet to be synthesized. In this paper, we will provide an example of language situations in Oklahoma as described by Mary Linn.

The Language Situation: The Example of Oklahoma

With the exception of California, Oklahoma has the most diversity of Native languages and peoples in the United States. There are 40 distinct indigenous communities there, represented by federally recognized tribes, tribal towns, or bands and non-federally recognized tribes, towns, or bands within these larger entities. These 40 communities are as large as the Cherokee community with 210,000 people or as small as the Tonkawa, Modoc, or Fort Sill Apache communities with 200-300 people. Significantly, 40 communities represent 11 language families: Algonquian, Athapaskan, Caddoan, Iroquoian, Kiowa-Tanoan, Muskogean, Penutian, Siouan, Tonkawan, Uto-Aztecan, and Yuchean. The languages across these families can be as different as Chinese and English. They represent extreme cultural diversity as well. People were forcibly removed to Oklahoma (Indian Territory) from the south and southeast, the northeast and Great Lakes, the High Plains, the southern plains, and coastal California. They brought with them their distinct beliefs, customs, and languages.

It is useful to remember the language situation in North America. Michael Krauss (1998) of the University of Alaska has presented the following classification of the vitality of the 211 languages still spoken or remembered:

Class A: 32 languages (15%) spoken by all generations, including children—life expectancy: two generations without immediate intervention

Class B: 36 languages (17%) spoken only by the parental general and up—life expectancy: 50 years

Class C: 85 languages (40%) spoken only by the grandparental generation and up—life expectancy: 40 years

Class D: 58 languages (28%) spoken only by the very elderly, usually less than 10 people—life expectancy: 10 years

All of the Native languages in Oklahoma are threatened; most are severely endangered. Only one community, the Oklahoma Kickapoo, has children speaking the language on a day-to-day basis (Class A). Choctaw has a few children speaking the language and a majority of the parental generation still speaking

the language (Class B). This is the case in some increasingly isolated areas of Cherokee Nation, but it is mostly the grandparental generation that speaks Cherokee (Class C). The remaining communities have many fewer speakers, all elderly (Class C-D). And, tragically, 14 communities have no more speakers at all. A few of these, such as the Alabama, have no speakers in Oklahoma, although there are a few Alabama speakers in their reservations in East Texas and Louisiana. Given this scenario, the language situation in Oklahoma requires immediate attention.

To get a sense of the breadth of language diversity in Oklahoma and of the critical state of the languages, we have made the chart shown below. The languages are organized by family. After each language, the number of speakers is given. The numbers are from Yamamoto (1996), Mithun (2000), and Linn's personal communication with Native language teachers and Elders in Oklahoma.

Linguistic Families of Oklahoma (with Number of Speakers)

Algonquian		
Absentee Shawnee 200	Kickapoo 1,500	Ottawa 0
Citizen Band Potawatomie NA	East. Shawnee 0?	Sac & Fox 20
Miami 0	Cheyenne 100?	Loyal Shawnee 14
Delaware 1?	Peoria 0	Arapaho NA
Athapaskan		
Plains Apache 3	Fort Sill Apache NA	
Caddoan		
Caddo 25	Pawnee 20	Wichita 0
Iroquoian		
Cherokee 10,000	Wyandotte 0	Senca-Cayuga 0
Keetoowah (Cherokee)		
Kiowa-Tanoan		
Kiowa 300		
Uto-Aztecan		
Comanche 100		
Muskogean		
Choctaw 11,000	Seminole (see Creek)	Alabama 0
Chickasaw 1,000-	Thlopthlocco (see Creek)	Coushatta 0
Creek 5,000	Kialegee (see Creek)	
Siouan		
Iowa 0	Kaw 0	Osage 5
Otoe-Missouria 1?	Ponca 24	Quapaw 0
Yuchean		
Euchee 12		
Penutian		
Modoc 0		
Tonkawan		
Tonkawa 0		

Beyond the reasons given in the introduction for language decline, tribes in Oklahoma experience some unique conditions that affect their language. We will mention a few that we feel shape the nature of language programs in Oklahoma. Unlike other areas, Oklahoma tribal people do not have a land base. There are no reservations in Oklahoma. Tribal people live scattered amidst the larger white society. Although there is a cohesive Indian subculture, most Native children grow up within the context of white culture, and they must go to special places, such as Indian churches, tribal towns, or ceremonial places, in order to be submersed in traditional cultural practices and, if lucky, the language. In addition, communities do not have control of their schools, nor are the majority of their children in a single public school. The Oklahoma Department of Education allows Native American languages to be taught as foreign languages in the pubic schools, but in this mixed environment, the languages are always taught as optional foreign languages in the upper levels, not as immersion or bilingual programs. Remember also that a new English Only initiative is at work in Oklahoma, and if this is passed, it will have a negative impact on Native language programs in public schools. Finally, most of the elected tribal governments do not have language maintenance and renewal as a priority.

Given all this, most language programs in Oklahoma are grassroots, and they struggle for funds, locations, teachers, environments in which to use the language, and even community-wide acceptance. All of the programs have innovative teaching ideas and have their successes and hard times. There are many significant successes along the way, such as staying afloat with no money, or having a language camp, or increasing attendance. Some successes may be more immediately measurable, such as teaching an important song to the children, having youth be able to say appropriate prayers, or learning how to greet each other appropriately in the language; however, it is the goal of all language programs to produce new speakers.

Our initial findings show that the path that all language programs take along the way has certain stages. First, the community's attitudes about their languages change. Then, their awareness of the language situation and their needs grow. Finally, their creativity blossoms to address the situation. The following sections outline these vital stages and then describe some of the successful approaches to language revitalization.

From Belief To Reality: Stages of Community and Language Revitalization

Commitment of the heart. A Cheyenne Elder stated:

> How much does the Cheyenne language weigh? How much does the Cheyenne language cost? How much room does the Cheyenne language occupy? How does the Cheyenne language feel, taste, or smell? What does it look like? If the Cheyenne language can be put into those quantifiable terms, then the more prevalent white society may understand the total impact of what it means to be losing the Cheyenne language. But we [Cheyenne people] will never be able to weigh the Cheyenne language. (Littlebear, 1994 as quoted in Reyhner, 1997, p. vi)

A strong belief underlying Native languages is that they are the soul and spirit of the people, and you cannot measure what language means to the people. This represents the belief of indigenous peoples about their ancestral languages. At the American Indian Language Development Institute at the University of Arizona, we have heard that "our language is a gift from Creator, "but we have also heard that, "because it is the gift from Creator, we must take care of it. We must nurture, develop, and transmit it to younger generations."

Awareness of the reality of language situation. Native people have begun to realize that their children are no longer acquiring their ancestral languages. A serious language shift has taken place, replacing their heritage languages with English. This shift is realized as a loss of intimate relationships among people. It was, they realized, the heritage language that established, nurtured, and developed affections, understanding, and trust among family members, members of the community, and in the relationship of the past, present, and future. Now, it has become apparent that there has been a major upheaval in the normal "invisible and unremarkable" (Brandt, 1988) process of heritage language acquisition formerly carried out in daily interactions among family members. The language is no longer heard as the medium of socialization and enculturation; it is lost or on the brink of being lost. Oftentimes, it is difficult to accept this reality, difficult to understand what went wrong (without blaming the outside forces), and difficult to know what to do to counter such language shift. It is especially difficult to accept that we need a "plan" and the development of "tools" to assess and address this situation.

Committed experimentation. There have been individuals and groups of individuals who were driven by a personal commitment to take action against this shift. Their actions can best be described as "committed experimentation" (Cummins, 1992). Such actions to reverse the language shift include: transcribing, translating, and interpreting archival documents such as audio taped oral traditions; creating space for language and culture within Head Start, elementary, and high school curricula; after-school community language programs; developing language materials and curriculum within grant programs; compiling, developing, and publishing dictionaries; establishing orthographies; developing and piloting grammar lessons; conducting immersion camps; conducting literacy development workshops; hosting tribal language summits; attending language institutes; and establishing a networking system of collaboration and co-operation among different programs. Such activities are occurring with or without the tribal, state, or federal support.

Re-contextualizing language and culture. When such activities attempting to reverse language shift occur, oftentimes the "heart of the people" (the language) becomes objectified. Objectified, it is no longer a living, dynamic means of expressing emotions, maintaining intimate relationships, and projecting a unique world. Instead, it becomes a language of study. This is a stark reminder that schools and classrooms continue to be perceived as a place where Indian students are taught the white man's ways in the white man's manner.

Transforming the culture of school. It is important to recognize that schools remain "contested space" (Lipka & Mohatt, 1998), in which fundamental changes must take place in the way teachers perceive themselves. Teachers must realize that they are the carriers of linguistic and cultural knowledge. They must strengthen their knowledge and experience of their heritage language and culture-they cannot afford to feel "inadequate and incompetent," especially when they compare themselves with other "non-Native" teachers. This also addresses the disparity that exists between those who are certified through teacher education programs and those who are not. Essentially, a "reverse brainwashing" of such teachers must occur (Watahomigie & McCarty, 1994), through which heritage language teachers can begin to legitimize their language and culture, validate their teaching, and incorporate community values into the schooling of children.

Re-creating classrooms. Heritage language teachers are often given the tremendous responsibility of developing language curricula and language materials and of teaching the language. Under such pressure, it is difficult for them to remember to utilize their speaking ability in a classroom setting in order to maximize their fluency. They face the challenge of creating a classroom that optimally approximates a natural language setting and that promotes communicative interactions between the teacher and students and between students and students. They face a challenge to do things in the language.

Changing attitudes from hurt to responsibility. All tribes and communities underwent attempted linguistic and cultural extermination through the government's boarding school system or through parochial education. It is true that the parents and grandparents of most of the language teachers and learners today were not allowed to speak their language; they were punished horribly if they did, and they have carried these fears of language learning with them ever since. However, in the last few years, there has been a change in attitude from one of "we can't because" to "it is my responsibility to teach my language" or "it is my responsibility to learn." Language is a responsibility, not a privilege. Successful language programs have students that feel that it is their responsibility to learn and to begin passing the language on to their families, and they have communities that feel it is their responsibility to promote language use, not simply give lip service to the importance. Often, when very few resources, such as speakers or money, are available, the learners feel the responsibility more, but this kind of feeling is spreading through all communities now.

There are many different types of language programs—from the most natural settings for language acquisition to the most objectified language learning as an academic subject. In all programs, we find general principles that guide us in our efforts in revitalizing our heritage languages.

Successful Approaches to Language Revitalization: What Works

The following is an initial list of characteristics that appear to be shared, partially or wholly, by successful language programs. Each could be the topic of a whole conference, but only a brief discussion is provided for each. No matter

what kind of program we may have implemented—whether the Master-Apprentice model, preschool immersion class, or after-school class—these characteristics seem to help overcome difficulties and enable these programs to be on their way to produce new speakers.

1. Using teams. Language programs that work with language teams have a high rate of success and, overall, a lower rate of frustration for the community teachers. A Language Team consists of Elders, community language teachers and advocates, and outside resource people, such as linguists and curriculum developers. It is important to stress that the linguists and education specialists are only advisors and perhaps promoters of new teaching methods (the master-apprentice style is one example); they do not run the show. Successful teams rely on the Elders in all final decision making. They are democratic among the community educators and language advocates. The outside resource people give guidance and, especially, training in language material collection and analysis and in curriculum and materials development. The result is materials that are accurate, consistent, culturally appropriate, and the community's own products.

We want to emphasize that there are "gifted" Elders in communities who offer more than just proficiency in the heritage language. These are Elders who, without specific training, have a profound understanding of their language and a remarkable ability to provide meaningful and insightful cultural interpretations of linguistic phenomena (including stories, songs, and general speaking). It is essential to have these Elders as members of the team.

2. Using immersion, speaking the language. Several years ago, the idea of immersion was new and rather frightening to most community language teachers. The Elders, especially, felt uncomfortable with the idea of staying in the language, especially when the students did not fully comprehend what they were saying. However, there has been a gradual change in this attitude. Part of this change has come from seeing successful immersion programs at work, and some of it is owing to training in using the immersion approach. Programs can use immersion during significant portions of a class or during parts of language camps (soft immersion). There can be more intensive immersion, as in the master-apprentice style, throughout an entire day, weekend, or week camp (total immersion). And there is the more natural immersion of just using the language with small children in Headstart or day care. If the goal is to revitalize the heritage language as the language of thinking, creativity, transmission of cultural tradition, and communication, then the only way to do so is by speaking it. By learning about the language, we will not achieve our goal. It is clear, though, that programs that have cut out the intermediate step of translating into English have much more success in producing speakers and in increasing the ability of the students to think the heritage language.

Re-introduction of the heritage language is important beyond learning the language itself. By offering the language through various programs, especially through immersion, these programs will promote the individual's responsibility in understanding and participating in cultural traditions. Such language classes provide an opportunity, particularly for junior high, high school, and college

level youth, to begin developing a personal and tribal identity firmly grounded in the heritage language and culture.

Because more and more communities are looking toward immersion, we have provided Kenneth Hale's typology of immersion programs in the Appendix on page 126. We find it an invaluable guide to the types and degrees of immersion that communities adopt.

3. Being family oriented. In a natural setting, children acquire language at home from their primary caregivers. In growing up with their family, children learn what is important from the family. Thus, it is more and more apparent that just teaching children the language does not work if they cannot go home and use the language with their parents or grandparents. Just teaching young adults does not work if they do not see their parents wanting to use the language. Teaching adults does not work if they have no one to talk to in the language. However, teaching to a family overcomes many of these obstacles. Classes and camps that encourage parent and extended family involvement with children see more progress in the children's and the adults' abilities to actually use the language. Some Head Start programs are making night classes for parents mandatory, and some communities are initiating master-family apprentice programs.

4. Setting goals. Any effective program should be based on a clear understanding of the community's language situation. The program designers and staff need to understand the community in which they implement their program. In one community, a survey designed to gage the youth "voice" discovered that the youth wanted more attention from parents, language instruction without criticism, and deeper knowledge of community values, history, and traditions.

Goals may be different for different communities. The goal may be to teach the young men how to use and understand the language for specific rituals. It may be to get several families using the language in their homes. Or it may be to have the ancestral language as the primary language of communication for the whole tribe. Set long term goals high, but have intermediate goals that are attainable. Classes that have these intermediate goals generally achieve them and experience less frustration in facing the very formidable task of teaching and learning an entire language. Pat yourself and your students on the back when you achieve them. No matter how modest immediate goals and objectives may be, this is a time to celebrate and to let your students and your community know that things are happening.

5. Building up not out. Communities with very few speakers left have found it necessary to produce new fluent speakers quickly so that these new younger speakers can become teachers. This urgent need to produce fluency can be met if several learners commit themselves to intensive language learning for several years. In these cases, the remaining speakers also must devote their time and energy to these few learners, which means when others come knocking at the door to learn, their learning may have to be postponed in order to utilize the limited human resources to the maximum. This, unfortunately, goes against most tribes' attitudes that language-language is for everyone. However, many of these communities have had to make a choice: They can teach everyone just a

bit about the language, or they can teach a few to really speak the language in order to build up the language (This was also the successful strategy of the Hawaiian language immersion program.) The key is that the people who do undergo this intensive training must also be committed to becoming teachers and to passing the language on to others. When the new teachers begin teaching the language, they will be teaching to more and more, or building the language out.

6. Balance in old and new. Balance and harmony are good in everything, but here we are specifically referring to the balance between old and new, between tradition and innovation. For example, successful programs will rely on their Elders for decisions and council, but the younger people need to have a voice in introducing new ideas, such as Master-Apprentice or CD-ROMs. Tribal languages are traditionally oral, and successful language programs will emphasize spoken language through the oral traditions of story telling, prayers, humour, and skilful oratory. However, they will also create quickly (and without too much argument) an alphabet or system of syllabics to use as a teaching tool or as an aid in some preservation projects.

7. Working through language variation issues. Many issues of language variation within a community can cause stress with language workers, no matter how devoted they are. But these issues can be and are resolved in many communities. In fact, they must be resolved before language programs can successfully move forward. Being aware of them as pitfalls and establishing mechanisms for discussion and resolution are essential.

(a) Oral Versus Written: When the number of fluent speakers declines, sometimes the language is guarded as sacred. Because the language was traditionally oral, some people think it should not be subjected to a written form. This kind of attitude may make the task of revitalization difficult because the most effective method of language revitalization is to surround the learners with the language. We already know that the "oral" language is not everywhere anymore. Stories are not being told as means of teaching and entertainment. The people's history is not being transmitted orally to younger generations. In addition to oral tradition, a new tradition of writing the language has become an important "addition" to the richness of the language resources.

(b) Writing System: If a language is to be documented in a written form, what writing system should be used? In some communities, a new way of writing the language is devised. In other communities, an orthography introduced by missionaries has become their writing tradition. In still other communities, there exist multiple ways of writing the language, as if there are as many writing systems as there are speakers.

(c) Variations: We often encounter variations within families, clans, bands, between males and females, and between young and old. The difficult issue often arises as to which variation should be taught without excluding the others.

(d) What Should Be Taught and How: How do we select what needs to be taught, and when? In the immersion approach, activities and what of the language should be taught and when need to be carefully planned. Some activities may be oriented toward pre-school children, some toward young adults, some toward adults, some toward females, some toward males, and some toward all generations and both genders.

8. Working through politics. Oftentimes, language revitalization efforts get entangled in local and family politics. Community-wide support is best. However, if we foresee difficulties in recruiting resource persons, Elders, language teachers, and even language learners, then it will be better not to formally involve the entire community. Start small and gradually expand the circle of teachers and learners.

9. Perseverance. Most of us are all too familiar with this, but it is worth repeating. Keep going no matter what: no money, no tribal support, personality problems in the group, the loss of speakers. In spite of the serious language shift situation, many endangered languages continue to be spoken. Awareness of the fragile situation of our heritage languages is being voiced and heard loud and clear across tribal communities. We must also spread a sense of hope and optimism, as we are trying to do by presenting this report, and form a strong support network among all of us.

What Is Not Necessary

1. Money. Do not wait for money. You can do a lot without money. Having little money actually helps the community and the students to be active parts of the class and to be more responsible for learning. Some classes have students help in making teaching materials to relieve the financial burden on the teacher (and they sure do learn how much effort the teacher spends each week!). Generally, the whole class or community gets behind fund-raising projects, which brings them together and creates another situation in which they can use and hear the language.

2. Tribal support. Do not wait for tribal council support. Seek tribal and community support and involvement as you do the work. Successful programs incorporate the entire community.

3. A large number of speakers. Of course, communities with a large base of speakers to draw upon as teachers, especially younger speakers, are blessed. However, some larger tribes with several thousand speakers are complacent. If you have 12 speakers and produce four new speakers through a master-apprentice program, it is better than 10,000 speakers doing nothing.

The Next Stages

We consider our first year of visiting language programs a success. We have visited to date 15 language programs in Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. We have compiled useful reports on the problems encountered and the creative strategies employed. We plan to continue the collection of this type of data next year, at least doubling the number the programs we visit and extending the visits

throughout the United States. This phase of tasks will lead to the production of "Facts" brochures and "How-to" brochures. Although this stage is preliminary, we would like to create brochures that include the following:

1. "Facts" Brochures
   - First language acquisition (perhaps several brochures)
   - How children acquire their first language. All children worldwide are born with the capacity for language. What is this capacity? What is necessary to develop it? (Does the language environment play a role? What is the role of the parents or caretakers?) Children's language develops in stages-what are the major stages of language development?
   - Second language acquisition (several brochures)
   - Is second language acquisition different from first language acquisition? What is the ideal situation for second language acquisition? Is there some ideal age at which to begin exposure to a second language? Do second language learners also go through stages?
   - Language learning/teaching methods (several brochures)
   - What are the ways to teach language? Which method is most effective to whom under what conditions? Where can one get training?
   - Native American languages (several brochures)
   - How many Native American languages are there in the US? What are their characteristics?
   - Native American language revitalization programs (several brochures)
   - What is the status of Native American languages in the US? In Canada? In Latin America? In South America? What are people doing to maintain and revitalize their languages? What programs are being implemented? Which program is effective to whom under what conditions? What is needed?
   - Bilingualism and biculturalism
   - What is bilingualism? What is biculturalism? Does bilingualism go hand-in-hand with biculturalism? Is bilingualism desirable?
   - Language and brain
   - What does the brain do for language? Is the monolingual's brain different from the brain of the bilingual? Why should we know about this?

2. "How-to" Brochures
   - How to document our language
   - How to prepare a grammar
   - How to prepare a dictionary
   - How to prepare language materials for teaching
   - How to use computers for language lessons
   - How to start a language program in school
   - How to start a language program for adults in the community
   - How to attract learners
   - How to recruit language teachers
   - How to train language teachers
   - How to evaluate the effectiveness of the program

- How to evaluate language materials
- How to get funding for ...
- How to get "experts" to work with us

With these tasks in mind, the ILI has undertaken the first phase of its goal-gathering information on various language programs in the North America.

Part IV: Summary and Conclusion

Over a period of four months, the three field linguists for ILI visited some 15 programs in the states of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma. These programs were all different, yet there were some similarities as well. Communities that host these programs are all facing the same serious issue: Even in communities where many families continue to use the heritage language as the major means of thinking and communicating, the number of the fluent speakers is getting smaller each year. Increasingly, fewer children are acquiring the language in natural settings, and the fluent speakers are often elderly.

In the process of designing, implementing, and evaluating programs, each program has faced issues and problems. What has made these programs successful, however, is that each has found a way to address those issues and problems. Remember that each community and each program has its own unique situation and condition under which the program is implemented. We expect to find more ways in which different communities have met these challenges. In spite of the rich variation of programs and approaches, it is the goal of the ILI Language Program to summarize the common issues and problems and how they may be resolved. The information we gather will be made available to all language programs—the veteran and those just starting up—through the ILI office, the ILI Web site, the brochures, and possibly monographs of certain programs.

We wish to thank all 15 programs that were willing to share with us and the larger audience about their programs, their practices, and their reflections. And we would like to thank those who have stated their willingness to share in the coming year. What we have found, the common challenges and individual innovations, will help everyone in the maintenance and revitalization of Native languages and in the reversal of negative attitudes toward our ancestral languages.

Our view of the importance of ancestral languages is expressed in the poem below recited at the 21st American Indian Language Development Institute at the University of Arizona by Solomon Ratt of Cree Nation.

Ahkami-n´hiyaw´tÅn kipˆkiskw´wininÅhk!

Ahkami-n´hiyaw´tÅn
kipˆkiskw´wininÅhk,
ast´w
kinisitohtamiwinaw.

Ahkami-n´hiyaw´tÅn
kipˆkiskw´wininÅhk,
ast´w
kipimÅtisiwinaw.

Ahkami-n´hiyaw´tÅn
kipˆkiskw´wininÅhk,
ast´w
kinisitaw´yimisonaw.

Ahkami-n´hiyaw´tÅn
kipˆkiskw´wininÅhk,
ast´w
kin´hiyawÅwinaw.

Let's keep on speaking Cree in our language!

Let's keep on speaking Cree
in our language,
there
our understanding is there.

Let's keep on speaking Cree
in our language,
there
our life is there.

Let's keep on speaking Cree
in our language,
there
our recognition of each other is there.

Let's keep on speaking Cree
in our language,
there
our Creeness is there.

Note: The ILI Home Page is: www.ipola.org or www.indigenous-language.org

References

Atkins, J.D.C. (1887). *Annual report of the commissioner of Indian affairs*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Brandt, Elizabeth, & Ayoungman, Vivian. (1988). A practical guide to language renewal and language maintenance. *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual NALI Institute*. Harah, OK: NALI.

Cantoni, Gina (Ed.). (1996). *Stabilizing indigenous languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University. http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/miscpubs/stabilize/index.htm

Crawford, James. (1989). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory and practice*. Trenton, NJ: Crane.

Crawford, James. (1992a). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of English Only*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Crawford, James. (1992b). *Language loyalties: A source book on the Official English controversy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cummins, Jim. (1992). The empowerment of Indian students. In Jon Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian students*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1991). *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Grenoble, Lenore A., & Whaley, Lindsay J. (Eds.). (1998). *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, Kenneth. (1999). Lecture notes on types of immersion programs. American Indian Language Development Institute, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ. June, 1999.

Hale, Kenneth; Krauss, Michael; Watahomigie, Lucille; Yamamoto, Akira; Craig, Collette; Jeanne, LaVerne Masayesva; & England, Nora. (1992). Endangered languages. *Language, 68*(1), 1-42.

Hinton, Leanne. (1994/5). Preserving the future: A progress report on the Master-Apprentice language learning program and ten points for successful language learning. *News From Native California, 8*(3), 14-20.

Hinton, Leanne. (1997). Survival of endangered languages: The California master-apprentice program. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 123*, 177-191.

Hinton, Leanne. (1994). *Flutes of fire: Essays on California Indian languages*. Berkeley, CA: Heyday.

Hornberger, Nancy H. (Ed.). (1996). *Indigenous literacies in the Americas*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jaspaert, Koen, & Kroon, Sjaak. (Eds.). (1990). *Ethnic minority languages and education*. Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Kapono, Eric. (1995). Hawaiian language revitalization and immersion education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 112*, 121-135.

Krauss, Michael. (1998). The condition of Native North American languages: The need for realistic assessment and action. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 132*, 9-21.

Littlebear, Richard (Ve'Kesonestooe). (1994). *An ethnographic study of Cheyenne Elders: Contributions to language and cultural survival*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Boston University.

Lipka, Jerry, & Mohatt, Gerald. (1999). *Transforming the culture of schooling: Yup'ik Eskimo examples*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Matsumura, Kazuto. (Ed.) (1998). *Studies in endangered languages* (Papers from the International Symposium on Endangered Languages, Tokyo, November 18-20, 1995). Tokyo: Hituzi Shobo.

McCarty, Teresa, & Schaffer, Rachel. (1992). Language and literacy development. In Jon Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian students*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

McCarty, Teresa, & Zepeda, Ofelia. (Eds.) (1998). Indigenous language use and change in the Americas. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 132*.

McCarty, Teresa; Watahomigie, Lucille; & Yamamoto, Akira (Eds.). (1999). Reversing language shift in Indigenous America: Collaborations and views from the field. *Practicing Anthropology 20*(2), 2-4.

Mithun, Marianne. (2000). *The languages of Native North America*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Newman, Paul. (1992). Fieldwork and field methods in linguistics. *California Linguistic Notes, 23*(2), 1-8.

Reyhner, Jon (Ed.). (1997). *Teaching indigenous languages*. Flagstaff, AZ: Center for Excellence in Education, Northern Arizona University. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/TIL_Contents.html

Robins, Robert H., & Uhlenbeck, Eugenius M. (Eds.). (1991). *Endangered languages*. Oxford: Berg.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, & Phillipson, Robert (Eds.). (1995). *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watahomigie, Lucille, & McCarty, Teresa. (1994). Bilingual/bicultural education at Peach Springs: A Hualapai Way of Schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education 69*(2), 26-41.

Watahomigie, Lucille, & Yamamoto, Akira. (1987). Linguistics in action: The Hualapai Bilingual/Bicultural Education Program. In Donald D. Stull & Jean J. Schensul (Eds.), *Collaborative research and social change: Applied anthropology in action* (pp. 77-98). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Yamamoto, Akira. (1996). Endangered languages data summary. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, 21*, 159-229.

Yamamoto, Akira, & Zepeda, Ofelia. (in press). Native American languages. In Edward Finegan & John Rickford (Eds.), *Languages in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zepeda, Ofelia, & Hill, Jane. (1991). The condition of Native American languages in the United States. In Robert Robins & Eugenius Uhlenbeck (Eds.), *Endangered languages* (pp. 135-155). Oxford: Berg.

Appendix

Different Degrees of Immersion [Adopted and modified from Kenneth Hale's Lecture at the 20th Annual American Indian Language Development Institute (June 1999). The types are organized from the highest degree of immersion (Type 1) to the lowest degree of immersion (Type 5)].

Type	Characteristics	Examples	Training	Parents	Planning
1	Totally natural. Doing things in the language all the time. Language abundant.	Home	No special training	Intensely involved	No need
2	Somewhat natural. Doing things in the language at planned times at planned places, mostly one-on-one. Language abundant during the planned time/place.	Master-apprentice Language nest Language camp	Minimal training (no English)	Involved & supportive	Required as a team
3	Somewhat artificial. Doing things in the language at planned time at planned places, mostly one-on-many. Situational syllabus. Language abundant for planned purposes	Immersion class	Intensive training in hands-on field experience	Maybe involved, all subject areas	Careful planning support necessary
4	Artificial. Doing language mostly in the language at planned time at planned places. Situational/grammar-based syllabus. Language for instructional purposes; selective.	Language class	Extensive training in linguistics, education, anthropology	Maybe involved, support useful	Careful planning
5	Academic. Teaching about language. Grammar- based syllabus. Language examples to illustrate characteristics of the language; highly selective and organized.	Language class	Intensive training in linguistics.	No	Careful planning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE